

I would point out, looking at the previous decisions in this respect, that mandatory instructions are quite acceptable and have been used in the past. As Citation 758 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition states:

The object of mandatory instructions is to define the course of action which the committee must follow.

If this House wishes to do so, it can give an instruction to the committee which is mandatory. It may be that there are other examples of mandatory instructions related to exactly how a committee should deal with a particular Bill, but I do not think there is any limitation on the authority or power of this House to give a committee a mandatory instruction with respect to the process or procedure it should follow in study of a particular Bill. If this House agrees, and I think it should because this is what Canadians want this House to do, they want the committee on Bill C-130 to travel and hear evidence across the country, then the motion is quite in order and should be passed, and the committee would be obliged to follow the instruction in its mandatory terms.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am going to hear the Hon. Member and also the Minister of State. I will hear the Hon. Member for Kamloops Shuswap and the Hon. Member for Windsor West if necessary, in reply. However, I take it the position of both the Hon. Member for Kamloops Shuswap and the Hon. Member for Windsor West is whether or not a mandatory motion of somewhat the same nature is procedurally in place, this is a permissive motion. The argument that is being put by both the representatives of the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party is that procedurally it ought to be allowed, and if it is put into the procedures for Private Members' Motions, the practical result is it may never come back for consideration. Do I understand the position of both spokespersons for the Opposition correctly? The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap. I just want to be sure I have the point and I will hear you later in detail.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, the intention of putting forward a permissive motion is that the permissive instruction is the most common and most commonly used, particularly coming from an opposition Member. The reason it was put forward as a permissive motion was that during the committee's deliberations of the last day when it was deciding on how to proceed, when the request came from both the opposition Parties to travel throughout Canada to allow people to have input into the deliberations of the committee, the government Members indicated that the legislative committee, of course, had no authority to travel, that there was no opportunity to travel. Therefore, it was in that spirit that we felt that since the committee itself had determined that under the existing rules it had no authorization to decide to travel throughout Canada, the question was put aside because it was not part of the terms of reference of the legislative committee.

It was at that point that we felt a permissive motion ought to be presented both from an opposition Party and a Member, not a Member of the Cabinet, not a Minister. There was also the

fact that if that was the committee's concern, a clear instruction from the House of Commons would then clearly remove that and would allow the committee to continue.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Windsor West. I just want to be sure I have the point.

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):** I do not intend to extend my general argument, but I do want to say, first, the one basic point we are making is that any motion with respect to the committee travelling should not be placed under Private Members' Business just because it is offered by a Member not of the Privy Council of the Government. Second, I have to admit that the motion could be read as a permissive motion but, as the Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) has said, if the concern of the Conservative majority on the committee was that they did not have the power to travel, and if they had the power they would do it, then, let us hope that such a motion as we are discussing now will clear the air and the Conservative majority will follow through if it is passed and allow the committee to travel.

• (1140)

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I will not take long on this matter. I simply want to point out that as a member of the committee which studied parliamentary reform, I can say quite firmly that as far as I can recollect, it was never the intention of the committee to have motions used in this way.

**Mr. Gauthier:** We discussed that.

**Mr. Friesen:** Further to that, whether this motion is either permissive or mandatory, one of the effects remains the same as a result of it. That is to say that if the committee travels it will involve an expenditure of funds and someone will have to pay for it.

**Ms. Mitchell:** Take it out of your propaganda budget.

**Mr. Riis:** You're using \$50 million for PR now, maybe you can set a little aside for travel.

**Mr. Darling:** Keep quiet!

**Mr. Speaker:** I would remind Hon. Members that I have heard from the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap and the Hon. Member for Windsor West twice, as well as the Minister of State. All Hon. Members have given them the courtesy of expressing their comments to the advantage of the Chair. I would ask that that courtesy continue.

**Mr. Friesen:** Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about exact budgetary figures but a principle of government, that is, its ability to govern. If motions can be introduced in the House at any time which affect budgetary decisions and which take away from the Government the decision-making process with respect to expenditures, then it fragments the Government's